arXiv:1403.5043v1 [hep-ph] 20 Mar 2014

Higgs inflation still alive

Yuta Hamada[*], Hikaru Kawai[†], Kin-ya Oda[‡] and Seong Chan Park[§]

[*†] *Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*
[‡] *Department of Physics, Osaka University, Osaka 560-0043, Japan*
[§] *Department of Physics, Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea*

March 21, 2014

Abstract

The observed value of the Higgs mass indicates that the Higgs potential becomes small and flat at the scale around 10^{17} GeV. Having this fact in mind, we reconsider the Higgs inflation scenario proposed by Bezrukov and Shaposhnikov. It turns out that the non-minimal coupling ξ of the Higgs-squared to the Ricci scalar can be smaller than ten. For example, $\xi = 7$ corresponds to the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r \simeq 0.2$, which is consistent with the recent observation by BICEP2.

[*]E-mail: hamada@gauge.scphys.kyoto-u.ac.jp
[†]E-mail: hkawai@gauge.scphys.kyoto-u.ac.jp
[‡]E-mail: odakin@phys.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp
[§]E-mail: s.park@skku.edu



Figure 1: Standard model Higgs potential for the Higgs mass 125.6 GeV.

The observed value of the Higgs mass $125.9 \pm 0.4\,\mathrm{GeV}$ [1] indicates that the Standard Model (SM) Higgs potential becomes small and flat at the scale around $10^{17}\,\mathrm{GeV}$; see e.g. [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9] for latest analyses.[1] See Fig. 1 for the Higgs potential around that scale for various values of the top quark mass [10]. We see that by tuning the top quark mass, we can make the first derivative at the inflection point arbitrarily small as shown by the blue (center) line. Note that the required tuning of the top quark mass is rather strict. The values of M_t are given to show the amount of tuning and should not be taken literally.[2] There are several arguments that this tuning is required by a principle such as the multiple point principle [17, 18, 19], the maximum entropy principle [20, 21], the classical conformality [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29], and the asymptotic safety [30].

It is known that this inflection point cannot be used to achieve a successful inflation [31, 21].[3] Slow-roll condition $|\eta_V| \lesssim 1$ restricts the field value to be very close to the inflection point. To earn a sufficient e-folding $N_* \simeq 60$ within this range of φ_*, the first derivative at the inflection point must be very small, and hence cannot yield the right amount of the amplitude $A_s \propto V_*/\epsilon_V$ at φ_*.

In Ref. [21], we have discussed a possibility that a new physics, such as string theory, modifies the Higgs potential above the scale $\Lambda \sim 10^{17}\,\mathrm{GeV}$. In this Letter, we pursue another possibility that the non-minimal coupling of the Higgs-squared to the Ricci scalar, $\xi\varphi^2\mathcal{R}$, leads to a successful inflection point inflation.

The main differences from the ordinary Higgs inflation scenario [34, 35, 36, 37, 38] are the following two points:[4]

- The e-folding is earned in passing the inflection point, and hence the relation $\epsilon_V \sim 1/N_*^2$ no longer holds. Therefore, the scalar-to-tensor ratio $r = 16\epsilon_V$ can be sizable to match the recent BICEP2 result [43]:

$$r = 0.2^{+0.07}_{-0.05} \tag{1}$$

[1] It is an intriguing fact that the bare Higgs mass also becomes small at the same scale [7, 10, 11]; see also Refs. [12, 13, 14]. The running Higgs mass after the subtraction of the quadratic divergence is considered e.g. in Ref. [15].

[2] The latest combined result for the top quark mass is $173.34 \pm 0.76\,\mathrm{GeV}$ [16]. Note that there can be a discrepancy between the pole mass M_t and the one measured at the hadron colliders; see e.g. Refs. [5, 10].

[3] See e.g. Refs. [32, 33] for attempts of the inflection point inflation.

[4] For the other attempts, see Refs. [39, 40, 41, 42].

at the 68% CL.

- ξ can be smaller than ten, since the Higgs quartic coupling λ is small at φ_* due to the tuning mentioned above.

We start from the same Lagrangian as the ordinary Higgs inflation [34, 36, 37]. The potential in the Einstein frame can be obtained from the effective potential

$$V(\varphi) = \frac{\lambda(\varphi)}{4}\varphi^4 \tag{2}$$

in the flat space, by setting $\varphi = \varphi_h$ with

$$\varphi_h := \frac{h}{\sqrt{1 + \xi h^2/M_P^2}}, \tag{3}$$

where h is the Higgs field in the Jordan frame.

The running coupling $\lambda(\mu)$ has a minimum at $\mu_{\rm min} \sim 10^{17\text{–}18}\,{\rm GeV}$, depending on the Higgs mass [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9].[5] Around the minimum, $\lambda(\mu)$ can be expanded as

$$\lambda(\mu) = \lambda_{\rm min} + \frac{\beta_2}{(16\pi^2)^2}\left(\ln\frac{\mu}{\mu_{\rm min}}\right)^2 + \frac{\beta_3}{(16\pi^2)^3}\left(\ln\frac{\mu}{\mu_{\rm min}}\right)^3 + \cdots, \tag{4}$$

where $\beta_2 \simeq 0.6$ in the SM [44]. The term proportional to β_3 and higher are small in the region of our interest, and we will neglect them hereafter. The value of $\lambda_{\rm min}$ depends on the top quark mass, and we can set it arbitrarily small by tuning the top quark mass within the current experimental bound.

For the potential $V(\varphi)$ to be monotonically increasing around the inflection point, it is necessary and sufficient that

$$\lambda_{\rm min} \geq \lambda_c := \frac{\beta_2}{(64\pi^2)^2} \sim 10^{-6}. \tag{5}$$

The equality holds when the potential has a plateau. That is, when we put $\lambda_{\rm min} = \lambda_c$, the point $\varphi_{\rm inflection} = e^{-1/4}\mu_{\rm min} \simeq 0.8\mu_{\rm min}$ becomes a saddle point with vanishing first and second derivatives.[6]

We set the value of $\lambda_{\rm min}$ slightly larger than λ_c to realize an inflection point inflation, while keeping the potential above $\varphi_{\rm inflection}$ sufficiently small by the introduction of ξ in order to evade the problem described above. The three cases $\lambda > \lambda_c$, $\lambda = \lambda_c$, and $\lambda < \lambda_c$ corresponds to the red (upper), blue (middle), and green (lower) curves in Fig. 1, respectively. An important point here is that the value of φ_h in Eq. (3) is saturated to $M_P/\sqrt{\xi}$ for large values of h ($\gg M_P/\sqrt{\xi}$), and therefore the potential does not grow rapidly. In order for this saturation to work to avoid too large η_V, we need $\varphi_{\rm inflection} \sim M_P/\sqrt{\xi}$, that is, $\xi \sim M_P^2/\mu_{\rm min}^2$.

As concrete examples, we show our results for several benchmark points with the parameter choice $\xi = 0, 3, 10, 100$, and 1000 with $\lambda_{\rm min} = 1.01\lambda_c$, $\beta_2 = 0.6$, and $\mu_{\rm min} = M_P/\sqrt{10}$ in the left panel in Fig. 2; the same figure is drawn in linear plot for $\xi = 10$ in the right panel.

[5] The Higgs quartic coupling grows above the minimum due to the contribution of the growing $U(1)_Y$ coupling. Qualitatively, the position and height of the minimum depend on the Higgs and top masses, respectively.

[6] There appears another inflection point at $e^{-11/12}\mu_{\rm min} \simeq 0.4\mu_{\rm min}$ too.



Figure 2: Left: Inflaton potential for $\xi = 0, 3, 10, 100$, and 1000 from above to below in log-linear plot. Right: the same for $\xi = 10$ in linear-linear plot.



Figure 3: h vs t in Einstein frame in Planck unit.

To fit the cosmological data, we can e.g. take $h_* = 0.896 M_P$, $\lambda_{\rm min} = 1.01\lambda_c$, $\mu_{\rm min} = 0.37 M_P$, $\xi = 7$ to get $r = 16\epsilon_V(h_*) = 0.19$, $N_* = 58$, $V(\varphi_{h_*})/\epsilon_V(h_*) = 5.0 \times 10^{-7}$ and $n_s(h_*) = 0.955$, where

$$\epsilon_V = \frac{M_P^2}{2V(\varphi_h)^2}\left(\frac{{\rm d}h}{{\rm d}\chi}\frac{{\rm d}V(\varphi_h)}{{\rm d}h}\right)^2, \qquad \eta_V = \frac{M_P^2}{V(\varphi_h)}\frac{{\rm d}h}{{\rm d}\chi}\frac{\rm d}{{\rm d}h}\left(\frac{{\rm d}h}{{\rm d}\chi}\frac{{\rm d}V(\varphi_h)}{{\rm d}h}\right), \tag{6}$$

with

$$\frac{{\rm d}\chi}{{\rm d}h} = \frac{\sqrt{1 + \xi\,(1+6\xi)\,h^2/M_P^2}}{1 + \xi h^2/M_P^2}. \tag{7}$$

For the same parameters, the Einstein-frame time evolution of the Higgs field h is plotted in Fig. 3. We see that substantial time is spent around the inflection point.

Once the tensor-to-scalar ratio is fixed to be $r \simeq 0.2$, the slow-roll parameter becomes $\epsilon_V(h_*) \simeq 0.013$, and the amplitude $A_s \propto V(\varphi_{h_*})/\epsilon_V(h_*)$ fixes the potential height $V(\varphi_{h_*})^{1/4} \simeq 2 \times 10^{16}\,{\rm GeV}$. The potential height is determined in our case to be $V(\varphi_{h_*}) \simeq \lambda(\varphi_{h_*}) M_P^4/\xi^2$, which is the same as the Higgs inflation. The difference is the value of $\lambda(\varphi_{h_*}) \simeq \lambda_{\rm min} \simeq \lambda_c \sim 10^{-6}$ that allows us to take $\xi \lesssim 10$.

In this Letter, we have matched the renormalization scale in the Einstein frame, as in Eq. (3). If we instead match it in the Jordan frame,[7] i.e. if we set $\varphi = h$

[7] It is argued in Ref. [45] that these two choices correspond to different theories.

in Eq. (2), we obtain the chaotic inflation at $h \gg M_P/\sqrt{\xi}$. In this region, the canonically normalized field is $\hat{\chi} \simeq \sqrt{6} M_P \ln \frac{hM_P}{\sqrt{\xi}\mu_{\rm min}^2}$ in the Einstein frame. The potential for $\hat{\chi}$ becomes quadratic:

$$V \simeq \frac{\lambda_{\rm min} M_P^4}{4\xi^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\beta_2 M_P^2}{48\xi^2 \left(16\pi^2\right)^2} \hat{\chi}^2. \tag{8}$$

We see that by taking $\xi \sim 100$, we get the right amount of the inflaton mass $\sim 10^{13}\,\text{GeV}$.

Acknowledgement

K.O. and S.C.P. thank Takuya Kakuda and Jinsu Kim for useful discussions. The work of Y.H. is partly supported by a Grant-in-Aid from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Fellows No. 25.1107. S.C.P. is supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2011-0010294) and (2011-0029758) and (NRF-2013R1A1A2064120). The work of K.O. is in part supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Nos. 23104009, 20244028, and 23740192.

References

[1] J. Beringer et al. (Particle Data Group), *2013 Review of Particle Physics*, Phys.Rev. **D86** (2012), 010001, and 2013 partial update for the 2014 edition.

[2] M. Holthausen, K. S. Lim, and M. Lindner, *Planck scale Boundary Conditions and the Higgs Mass*, JHEP **1202** (2012), 037, 1112.2415.

[3] F. Bezrukov, M. Y. Kalmykov, B. A. Kniehl, and M. Shaposhnikov, *Higgs Boson Mass and New Physics*, JHEP **1210** (2012), 140, 1205.2893.

[4] G. Degrassi, S. Di Vita, J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, et al., *Higgs mass and vacuum stability in the Standard Model at NNLO*, JHEP **1208** (2012), 098, 1205.6497.

[5] S. Alekhin, A. Djouadi, and S. Moch, *The top quark and Higgs boson masses and the stability of the electroweak vacuum*, Phys.Lett. **B716** (2012), 214–219, 1207.0980.

[6] I. Masina, *The Higgs boson and Top quark masses as tests of Electroweak Vacuum Stability*, Phys.Rev. **D87** (2013), 053001, 1209.0393.

[7] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai, and K.-y. Oda, *Bare Higgs mass at Planck scale*, Phys.Rev. **D87** (2013), no. 5, 053009, 1210.2538.

[8] F. Jegerlehner, *The Standard model as a low-energy effective theory: what is triggering the Higgs mechanism?*, (2013), 1304.7813.

[9] D. Buttazzo, G. Degrassi, P. P. Giardino, G. F. Giudice, F. Sala, et al., *Investigating the near-criticality of the Higgs boson*, JHEP **1312** (2013), 089, 1307.3536.

[10] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai, and K.-y. Oda, *Bare Higgs mass and potential at ultraviolet cutoff*, (2013), 1305.7055.

[11] I. Masina and M. Quiros, *On the Veltman Condition, the Hierarchy Problem and High-Scale Supersymmetry*, Phys.Rev. **D88** (2013), 093003, 1308.1242.

[12] M. Al-sarhi, I. Jack, and D. Jones, *Quadratic divergences in gauge theories*, Z.Phys. **C55** (1992), 283–288.

[13] D. Jones, *The quadratic divergence in the Higgs mass revisited*, Phys.Rev. **D88** (2013), 098301, 1309.7335.

[14] N. Haba, K. Kaneta, and R. Takahashi, *Planck scale boundary conditions in the standard model with singlet scalar dark matter*, (2013), 1312.2089.

[15] L. Bian, *RGE, the naturalness problem and the understanding of the Higgs mass term*, (2013), 1308.2783.

[16] D0 Collaborations, T. ATLAS, CDF, and CMS, *First combination of Tevatron and LHC measurements of the top-quark mass*, (2014), 1403.4427.

[17] C. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, *Standard model criticality prediction: Top mass 173 +- 5-GeV and Higgs mass 135 +- 9-GeV*, Phys.Lett. **B368** (1996), 96–102, hep-ph/9511371.

[18] C. Froggatt, H. B. Nielsen, and Y. Takanishi, *Standard model Higgs boson mass from borderline metastability of the vacuum*, Phys.Rev. **D64** (2001), 113014, hep-ph/0104161.

[19] H. B. Nielsen, *PREdicted the Higgs Mass*, (2012), 94–126, 1212.5716.

[20] H. Kawai and T. Okada, *Solving the Naturalness Problem by Baby Universes in the Lorentzian Multiverse*, Prog.Theor.Phys. **127** (2012), 689–721, 1110.2303.

[21] H. Kawai, *Low energy effective action of quantum gravity and the naturalness problem*, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A28** (2013), 1340001.

[22] K. A. Meissner and H. Nicolai, *Conformal Symmetry and the Standard Model*, Phys.Lett. **B648** (2007), 312–317, hep-th/0612165.

[23] K. A. Meissner and H. Nicolai, *Effective action, conformal anomaly and the issue of quadratic divergences*, Phys.Lett. **B660** (2008), 260–266, 0710.2840.

[24] S. Iso, N. Okada, and Y. Orikasa, *Classically conformal $B - L$ extended Standard Model*, Phys.Lett. **B676** (2009), 81–87, 0902.4050.

[25] S. Iso, N. Okada, and Y. Orikasa, *The minimal $B-L$ model naturally realized at TeV scale*, Phys.Rev. **D80** (2009), 115007, 0909.0128.

[26] H. Aoki and S. Iso, *Revisiting the Naturalness Problem – Who is afraid of quadratic divergences? –*, Phys.Rev. **D86** (2012), 013001, 1201.0857.

[27] S. Iso and Y. Orikasa, *TeV Scale B-L model with a flat Higgs potential at the Planck scale - in view of the hierarchy problem -*, PTEP **2013** (2013), 023B08, 1210.2848.

[28] M. Hashimoto, S. Iso, and Y. Orikasa, *Radiative symmetry breaking at the Fermi scale and flat potential at the Planck scale*, Phys.Rev. **D89** (2014), 016019, 1310.4304.

[29] M. Hashimoto, S. Iso, and Y. Orikasa, *Radiative Symmetry Breaking from Flat Potential in various U(1)' models*, (2014), 1401.5944.

[30] M. Shaposhnikov and C. Wetterich, *Asymptotic safety of gravity and the Higgs boson mass*, Phys.Lett. **B683** (2010), 196–200, 0912.0208.

[31] G. Isidori, V. S. Rychkov, A. Strumia, and N. Tetradis, *Gravitational corrections to standard model vacuum decay*, Phys.Rev. **D77** (2008), 025034, 0712.0242.

[32] R. Allahverdi, K. Enqvist, J. Garcia-Bellido, and A. Mazumdar, *Gauge invariant MSSM inflaton*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **97** (2006), 191304, hep-ph/0605035.

[33] T. Imai and K. I. Izawa, *Minimal Fine Tuning in Supersymmetric Higgs Inflation*, (2013), 1305.5307.

[34] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, *The Standard Model Higgs boson as the inflaton*, Phys.Lett. **B659** (2008), 703–706, 0710.3755.

[35] S. C. Park and S. Yamaguchi, *Inflation by non-minimal coupling*, JCAP **0808** (2008), 009, 0801.1722.

[36] F. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, *Standard Model Higgs boson mass from inflation: Two loop analysis*, JHEP **0907** (2009), 089, 0904.1537.

[37] F. Bezrukov, A. Magnin, M. Shaposhnikov, and S. Sibiryakov, *Higgs inflation: consistency and generalisations*, JHEP **1101** (2011), 016, 1008.5157.

[38] A. Salvio, *Higgs Inflation at NNLO after the Boson Discovery*, Phys.Lett. **B727** (2013), 234–239, 1308.2244.

[39] K. Kamada, T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, *Higgs G-inflation*, Phys.Rev. **D83** (2011), 083515, 1012.4238.

[40] K. Kamada, T. Kobayashi, T. Takahashi, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, *Generalized Higgs inflation*, Phys.Rev. **D86** (2012), 023504, 1203.4059.

[41] K. Kamada, T. Kobayashi, T. Kunimitsu, M. Yamaguchi, and J. Yokoyama, *Graceful exit from Higgs G-inflation*, Phys.Rev. **D88** (2013), 123518, 1309.7410.

[42] K. Nakayama and F. Takahashi, *Higgs Chaotic Inflation and the Primordial B-mode Polarization Discovered by BICEP2*, (2014), 1403.4132.

[43] BICEP2, http://bicepkeck.org/.

[44] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai, and K.-y. Oda, *Minimal Higgs inflation*, PTEP **2014** (2014), 023B02, 1308.6651.

[45] F. Bezrukov, *The Higgs field as an inflaton*, Class.Quant.Grav. **30** (2013), 214001, 1307.0708.